

Appln. No. 09/881,938
Amendment dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 19, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The May 19, 2004 Office Action and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. In response, claims are cancelled and added, and remarks are set forth below in a sincere effort to place the present application in form for allowance. The amendments are supported by the application as originally filed. Therefore, no new matter is added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action claim 5 is rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 because the Examiner contends that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the high-definition image." In response, claim 5 is cancelled thereby rendering the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner's indication that claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations fo the base claim and any intervening claims is acknowledged and appreciated.

Appl. No. 09/881,938
Amendment dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 19, 2004

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In the Office Action claims 1-27, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over USP 5,475,656 (Sato et al.) in view of USP 6,567,915 (Guthery). In response, claims 1-30 are cancelled and new claims 31-40 are added. New claim 31 corresponds to claim 28 in independent form, claim 34 corresponds to claim 28 but is not in means-plus-function form, new claim 37 corresponds to claim 31 but does not include the term "of a card shape" and new claim 40 is a method claim corresponding to claim 31. Claims 32 and 33, 35 and 36, and 38 and 39 correspond to claims 27 and 29 respectively, but are dependent on claims 31, 34 and 37. Each of claims 31, 34, 37 and 40 are allowable over the prior art of record for reasons, *inter alia*, for the allowance of claim 28. Claims 32, 33, 35, 36, 38 and 39 are patentable over the cited references in view of their dependence on one of claims 31, 34 or 37.

It is respectfully believed that no additional fees are due for presentation of claims 31-40 since the present application as amended includes ten (10) total claims including four (4) independent claims, and the highest number of total claims and independent claims for which payment was previously made in connection with this application is thirty (30) and fourteen (14)

Appln. No. 09/881,938
Amendment dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 19, 2004

respectively. If, however, any additional fees are due for the presentation of claims 31-40, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-1378 for such sum.


* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where there is support for a contrary view.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert P. Michael
Reg. No. 35,614

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
767 Third Avenue - 25th Floor
New York, New York 10017-2032
Tel. (212) 319-4900
Fax (212) 319-5101
RPM/ms